

Pam.  
India

1058

Williams, T.

**A FARCE, -**

**A Religion professedly based on  
a book, which, as translated for  
that religion, has no existence.**

**No. 2.**

**There is Idolatry in the Vedas.**

---

The 'France' Press.  
S. P. G. Mission, Rewari.  
1894.

— : o : —







# **A FARCE, -**

## **A Religion professedly based on a book, which, as translated for that religion, has no existence.**

---

### **No. 2.**

In No. 1 it was shown what the 'Religion' and what the 'book' were that are here referred to. It was there stated that the 'Religion' was that of the followers of the late Dayanand Sarasvati, and the 'book' was the Veda. Advantage was taken of a Shastrath (religious discussion) that had, a few days before, been held at Jummoo, to demonstrate that the interpretation of the Veda as given by the Dayanandis cannot be relied upon i. e. that it was farcical. The best proof that that demonstration was complete, is the fact, that as far as the writer of Farce No. 1 is aware, no refutation of it has been made, or even attempted.

By reference to the Arya Pattrika of March 22nd. '92 it will be seen that the said Shastrath began with the orthodox pandits maintaining that there was Idolatry in the Vedas, and that on the other hand, the Dayanandis denied this. It is the purpose of this 'Farce No 2' to prove that the orthodox pandits were right, but that the Dayanandis were wrong i. e. to prove that, -

### **There is Idolatry in the Veda.**

Clearly the first thing to do is to define 'Idolatry.' My definition is already on record, in the Arya Pattrika of June 18th. '89. In my article in that issue, it is said that "Idolatry is the worship of anything whatsoever other than God." There and then Guru Datta, at that time the highest authority among the Dayanandis, expressly gave his assent to this definition. His words are "We quite concur with this definition. Idolatry is, 'worship of anything whatsoever other than God.'" This agreement is most valuable, for it is absolutely necessary that both parties be quite at one as



to what the word 'Idolatry' really means. But here at once the question arises 'Do both parties agree also as to what they understand by 'God'? It will be seen that we do agree; on our part we all hold that 'There is but one living and true God, everlasting without body, parts or passions; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible.'

Similarly in the Arya Pattrika of March 16, 1886, is printed what is called the 'Aryan Decalogue' and its 1st. and 2nd. articles are to this effect, - (1) "God is the original cause of all true knowledge and of all things made known by it, (2) The Supreme being is true, intelligent, happy, without beginning, almighty, just, merciful, unborn, infinite, unchangeable, incomparable, all supporting, all governing, all pervading, omniscient, undecaying, immortal, fearless, eternal, holy, and maker of universe (sic) He alone is to be worshipped."

The verbosity and want of precision of this Dayanandi definition of God is not to be wondered at, for the members of the Arya Samaj are not such masters of English as their confreres of the Brahmo Samaj. But what is to be wondered at is the sentiment of the definition!! 'What' one is tempted to exclaim, 'do these people really believe of God, that He is one, is eternal, all-knowing, almighty, all-sustaining, holy, beneficent, the only object of worship.'!! They are neither Christians, nor Muhammadans, nor Jews, and yet in all the world these are the only known Religions putting forth this as their fundamental dogma, and triumphantly challenging an examination of their Shastras respectively, as to whether this dogma be or be not indeed their fundamental one. It is so, each of these Religions is virtually united to its Shastra. Both Shastra and Religion mutually support and explain each other. Were it not so, they must both long ere this have perished.

Can this new sect so challenge? Has it a Shastra that it can as confidently claim to be judged by? Yes, it has a Shastra and claims to be judged by it, but upon one condition and that is that its own, and no one else's interpretation of that Shastra be taken. What is the result? This, - that that interpretation turns out, when examined, to be



## Simply a Farce.

Let us see how. It is clear that, on their own admission the Dayanandis must condemn Idolatry as strongly as any Christian, Jew or Muhammadan, would. Accordingly they are bound to assert that their Veda neither contains nor teaches Idolatry, nay, that on the contrary it denounces it. They do so. Sums of money have been, it is said, offered from time to time by them as rewards for any one who can show that there is Idolatry in the Veda. No one has ever gained any of this money, simply because the decision as to whether the applicant had proved his point or no, rested, it is said, with the Dayanandis themselves! And yet nothing can really be easier than to show that there is Idolatry in the Vedas.

Would not the worship of FIRE be idolatry? If we know that some people take fire and placing it in position do namas (bowing) to it as if it could see what they did; if we hear them muttering verses directed to that fire in which the very word 'fire' occurs, as if it could hear them; if we hear them calling out to it, 'O Fire.' 'O Fire,' not twice, but again and again, as if I say it really could hear them; if we hear them calling out O Fire, and then praising it in the most extravagant manner, as if it understood and could be moved by that praise; if we hear them actually praying to that fire and begging it to grant whatever they chose to ask it, as if it could really do all they ask it to do, — I say, — if we see and hear all this, is there any one in the wide world who would not say that here assuredly was **THE WORSHIP OF FIRE.**

Now we do find all this done by the Hindus, and we find their Vedas and Shastras enjoining how it is to be done. In particular we find in the Yajur Veda and its dependent S'ranta Sutra how Fire is to be worshipped — how the wood is to be laid, how it is to be kindled, and how the Fire is to be fed. There are the minutest directions given for all this. Again we find in the Rgveda how extravagantly fire is praised and prayed to. All this is incontestable fact.

If now this be not Idolatry, then what is? Whatever the image be, whether fire, or stone, or wood, or tree, or



Sun, or air, or sky, or dawn, &c. the worship paid is all alike in this that it is Idolatry - 'the worship of other than God.' No one hesitates to say, when he sees a man bowing reverently to a stone that cannot see; speaking to it, though it cannot hear, praising it though it cannot understand, and praying to it though it cannot help, - no one hesitates to call this Idolatry. Fire can no more see than that stone can, can no more hear, or understand or help. Why should the worship of the stone be called Idolatry, and that of the fire not? **THE WORSHIP OF THE LATTER IS UNDOUBTEDLY AS MUCH IDOLATRY AS THAT OF THE FORMER.**

But the fire-worshippers may object, - "It is not the fire itself we worship, but a something. - a deity inside it, - invisible to our eyes, but a something the fire well represents." If this were true, it would be still Idolatry, **FOR THE VERY SAME REPLY IS MADE BY ALL IDOLATERS WHATSOEVER.** We see ignorant multitudes worshipping that ugly red-lead besmeared mass of mortar, which they call Mata. We know full well, that it is not that ugly, dirty, mass of mortar itself, they worship, but a mysterious agency, malignant it may be, or benign, which they believe somehow localises itself in or around that misshapen mass. It is so with the worshipper of the repulsive Bhairoo, or Doorga. But it is just this that is called Idolatry and just these that are called Idolaters. The fire-worshipper therefore - the Parsee for instance - no less than these, is an Idolater and his worship Idolatry.

Here one can imagine the Dayanandis protesting, - "All this is directed against us, but we are not fire-worshippers." My reply is, - "If the Rgveda be your Shastra and you say it is, then disclaim it as you may, you are certainly fire-worshippers and therefore Idolaters." I will now proceed to show that if the Rgveda inculcates anything, it assuredly inculcates the worship of fire.

I must first however enter a caveat against the way in which the names of the gods in the Rgveda are translated. Why, I would ask, do translators of Sanskrit into English keep in their English translations the Sanskrit word instead of giving its English equivalent? Why, for instance should the Sanskrit word Agni be kept in those translations, in-



stead of giving its English equivalent, — FIRE. To the writers of the Rgveda the word 'Agni' always meant FIRE whether deified or not deified; the word 'vayu' always meant AIR, whether deified or not deified; the word 'Surya' always meant SUN whether deified or not. That translation is the truest, that best represents the thought the original writer had when he wrote. In all the Rgveda the word Agni occurs 1590 times in the singular number, and in all these instances it means FIRE AND FIRE ONLY, whether deified or not. If the translator wish to theorise it would certainly help him to keep the original Sanskrit word Agni; but if he wish to give a genuine translation, then he would most truly represent the Sanskrit writer by giving FIRE for Agni, for to that writer Agni was I say, simply fire and fire only whether deified or not. Had the authors of the Rgveda hymns written in English, then wherever we now find, in their Sanskrit, the word 'Agni' we should assuredly have, in their English, the word 'Fire.' If this be true, then it is clear, that the regular use of the word 'Agni' instead of the word 'fire' must, more or less, obscure the sense even to the English reader, while to the English knowing Hindoo it not only obscures the sense, but I venture to say has contributed not a little, to his even translating the word Agni by the word 'God.' This the Dayanandi very frequently does, and wishes us thereby to understand that Agni is God, in the sense of the definition of 'God' quoted on page 2. and so wittingly or unwittingly incurs the charge of blasphemy. In proof of what I say, take the Arya Pattrika for the 23rd of March last. On its first page and in its first column, the word 'Agni' in Sanskrit occurs twice. Its translation both times should be, of course in English 'O Fire.' But what does our Dayanandi say? In the former case he translates 'Agni.' 'O Glorious God,' and in the latter, 'O omniscient God,' and yet the word is I repeat, simply 'Agni,' whose only possible translation is, 'O Fire'!!! Have I not called the Dayanandi translation of the Veda, 'a farce'? One is inclined to give it a worse epithet. But Mr. Durga Prasad, — for this is the name I have reasons for thinking, of the Dayanandi who made the translation — does but, of course, follow his Teacher, Dayanand



Saraswati, in so translating. I have by me the translation by this leader, of the first 89 hymns of the Rgveda. In them the word Agni occurs 169 times. Of these only twice does he allow it the meaning of simply 'fire.' Of the rest, 42 times he either directly calls it Parameshwar i, e, God, or else uses of it terms that are only applicable to Him. The remaining instances are simply paraphrases exhibiting in their application uncommon but perverted ingenuity !!

All this goes to confirm the conclusion of Farce No. 1, — "that every translation made by a Dayanandi of any passage whatsoever of the Veda, must be received with suspicion, and never be relied upon unless corroborated by the testimony of some one of whose honesty and knowledge there be no doubt." But to return to the Rgveda.

On page 5 it was said that the word 'agni' (fire) occurs 1590 times in the singular number. In 392 instances it is in the Nominative case; 268 times in the Accusative; 7 in the Instrumental; 47 in the Dative; 54 in the Genitive or Ablative; 23 in the Locative; BUT IT IS 799 TIMES IN THE VOCATIVE. Now, the significance of this must be noted. Observe, — IT OCCURS IN THE VOCATIVE AS OFTEN, AS IN ALL THE OTHER CASES PUT TOGETHER! About 800 times the cry, — 'O Fire' — is recorded in the Rgveda. Only one other cry, surpasses it in frequency and that is 'O Indra' (— 'Thunder-god' —) which occurs 1110 times!!! Just as now the cry mostly heard is 'O Rama,' so then it was mostly 'O Fire' or 'O Indra' with which the Indian forests resounded. These are the two great Vedic deities — Fire and the Thunder-god. Considerably more than one third of the Rgveda is taken up with their worship, but of the 10,177 verses of which the Rgveda consists, 1962 belong to the worship of Fire. More than these belong to the Thunder-god. Those belonging to the Air-god, the Rain-god, the Sky-god, the Sun-god, &c. are far — very far — fewer.

Remember then that in the Rgveda, Fire is directly addressed no fewer than 799 times! Fire, is the image, the Idol. To call it 'Idol,' is indeed most appropriate, for the word means something SEEN. The fire-worshipper had his god in visible form before him, and to it he addressed his



praise and prayers. So much must suffice for the **NAME** itself. — Fire.

But to bring the matter sufficiently home, it should be asked, — “You say the god is Fire. — Are there not descriptions made of, and epithets applied to, this Fire-god, which show clearly that it is simply fire itself, as fire, and nothing else, that is worshipped?” That there are, and that to such an extent that the very abundance of them is embarrassing!! Indeed to illustrate the point fully all the 1962 verses occupied with the worship of Fire, should be taken, for (— and this I want especially to impress on our readers —) **THERE IS NOT A CONCEPT THAT FINDS EXPRESSION IN THEM BUT CAN BE SHOWN TO BE ULTIMATELY DERIVABLE FROM FIRE.** A many paged volume would be required for this. I shall therefore content myself now with giving a few epithets only, and a single verse. And first the verse, —

त्वमग्ने द्युमिस्त्वमाशुशुक्षानिस्त्वमद्भ्यस्त्वमश्मनस्परि ।

त्वं वनेभ्यस्त्वमोषधीभ्यस्त्वं नृणानृपते जायसे शुचिः ॥

Rgveda 2. 1. 1.

As translated by Max Muller, but putting the word ‘Fire’ for his word “Agni,” this verse means, —

“THOU, O FIRE, ART BORN WISHING TO SHINE FORTH, THOU ART BORN FROM THE SKIES, THOU FROM THE WATERS, THOU FROM THE STONE, THOU FROM THE WOOD, THOU FROM THE HERBS, THOU, KING OF MEN, THE BRIGHT ONE.”

It would be difficult to improve upon this translation. That of Griffith, differs from this seriously, only as to the word “dyubhis” which Max Muller translates, “from the skies,” but Griffith, “through the days.” In this Griffith has the support of both Sayanacharya and Yaska. The latter’s (Yaska’s) task was (6. 1. 1.) to explain just one word, — “Ashushukshanis” — which occurs here, and nowhere else, in the whole of the Rgveda. For this purpose he quotes the whole verse, and says of “dyubhis” that it means “by the days.” Yaska’s Commentator translates the whole verse word by word. In Max Muller’s and Griffith’s translations



combined we have the verdict, as to the verse's meaning, of all European scholars, for Griffith professedly represents not his own opinion merely but that of the other European scholars who had ever translated it before him. On the other hand, in Sayanacharya's and Yaska's translations we have the **TRADITIONAL** rendering adhered to by all Hindoo Pandits. We see then, that, with little variation, European and Hindoo scholars agree as to what this verse means, and that that meaning may be confidently taken to be really that that is given above.

Now, the question is, — 'What have we here the description of?' It is evidently a **DESCRIPTION**. We may venture to call it a **DEFINITION**. What then is the thing described? What is the thing defined? That thing is surely, beyond all doubt, **FIRE**, and **FIRE** only. We all know — it needs no **REVELATION** to tell us it — that by friction fire is produced in wood; that by smartly striking a hard stone by a piece of steel a spark is produced from that stone; — we know that the lightning burns and that the sun heats and that by means of the hearth fire we cook. The Vedic poet only mentions what every child has observed. Where is the mystery? Where the revelation?

But mark, that the fire thus described is the very thing addressed. The poet exclaims "O Fire" and proceeds to describe it as such. His description he intends for praise. It is so verse by verse for 15 verses, but in the 16th verse he **PRAYS** to it. In 14 out of the 15 verses he repeats the cry "O Fire" and in the 16th begs of it to **LEAD HIMSELF, HIS PEOPLE AND HIS BENEFACTORS TO WEALTH**. Here clearly our poet is a worshipper and **FIRE IS HIS GOD. — FIRE IS HIS VISIBLE IDOL. THERE IS THEREFORE IDOLATRY IN THE VEDAS**.

But we have recorded (page 6) that this idol, **FIRE**, is directly and formally addressed 799 times in the **Rgveda**. If each of these 799 occasions of the cry "O Fire" be taken and honestly discussed, the result, we have no hesitation in saying, would be the same as that we have arrived at in considering the cry 'O Fire' in **Rgveda 2. 1. 1. i. e.** that there is **Idolatry in the Vedas** and that **Fire is the Idol**. Every such an occasion is itself a separate proof of this



statement. **WE HAVE CONSEQUENTLY 799 PROOFS, AT LEAST, THAT WHEN THE DAYANANDIS SAY, THERE IS NO IDOLATRY IN THE VEDAS, THEY GIVE THE VEDA THE LIE.**

Again, it must be remembered, that there are 1962 (see page 6) verses of the Rgveda occupied with the worship of this idol Fire, that is, since there are altogethor 10,177 verses in that Veda, about one fifth of it, has been demonstrated to be occupied with Idolatry i. e. with "the worship of other than God" (vid page 1.) !!!

But now let us come to closer quarters. It is the constant assertion of the Dayanandis that **IN THE VEDA THERE IS BUT ONE GOD DESCRIBED, ONE GOD ONLY, WORSHIPPED.** Their definition of this one God has been given on page 2. It follows therefore that **WHATEVER GOD BE MENTIONED, BE CALLED UPON, BE PRAISED, BE PRAYED TO, IN THE VEDA, THAT GOD MUST BE THIS VERY ONE GOD WHOM THE DAYANANDIS IN THAT WAY DEFINE.** We have seen that 1962 verses are solely occupied with the worship of a god called 'Fire.' We have seen that in those 1962 verses, that very god. — 'Fire' — is 799 times directly addressed as 'O Fire.' **THIS 'FIRE' THEN MUST BE THE ONE GOD OF THE DAYANANDIS, WORSHIPPED IN THOSE 1962 VERSES, AND DIRECTLY ADDRESSED THERE 799 TIMES.** This god 'Fire' must answer therefore to their definition in every particular. If so then this god 'Fire' must be "without beginning," must be "almighty," must be "unborn," must be "infinite," must be "unchangeable," must be "immortal," must be "undecaying," and must be "eternal."

But we have another definition of this god Fire, and that definition is Vedic, and therefore certainly, from a Dayanandi point of view, must be the only true one. But on comparison we find the Vedic definition flatly contradicting the Dayanandi one !!! Let us make the comparison, —

<u>THE DAYANANDI GOD.</u>	<u>THE VEDIC GOD.</u>
as defined in the Aryan Decalogue (see p. 2.)	as defined in Rgveda (2. 1, 1.)
I. is	(see p. 7.) I. is
(a) 'unborn'	(a) 'born' - i. e. a flat contradiction;



(b) 'without beginning'	(b) 'born,' and therefore had a beginning;
(c) 'infinite,'	(c) 'born,' and therefore not infinite;
(d) 'eternal,'	(d) 'born,' and therefore not eternal;
II. This Dayanandi god is	II. The Vedic god is 'born' as lightning, or a spark, or as the forest fire, or as the hearth fire, and as such
(a) 'unchangeable,'	(a) changes;
(b) 'undecaying,'	(b) decays;
(c) 'immortal,'	(c) perishes; and therefore is neither 'unchangeable' nor 'undecaying' nor 'immortal.'
III. The Dayanandi god is	III. The Vedic god is
'almighty'	'born' and therefore cannot be 'almighty,' for it is, in the modes above mentioned, the product of friction, and can in this way be produced even by a child. Man largely controls it, and finds it a good slave but bad master.

(Note how clearly the "verbosity and want of precision" charged against the Dayanandi definition, on p. 2, are exhibited in this comparison!)

Can contradiction be more complete than this? And if this be the havoc made in the Dayanandi position by one verse, how crushing must that havoc be when made 1962 times!!! – for such is the number of verses (see p. 6) devoted to the worship of Fire in the Rgveda. This being the case, one is tempted to ask what then is the Shastra from which the Dayanandis drew their definition of God? Whatever be that Shastra, it cannot clearly be the Veda, for we have now seen that one fifth of that Veda flatly contradicts it! It will be found indeed that the whole Veda does so,



but our present examination has extended only over one fifth of it. What then is the Shastra from which they drew? The answer is simply – **THE BIBLE. DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY. NO OTHER BOOK IN ALL THE WORLD'S LITERATURE SUPPLIES ALL THE KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED FOR THE WHOLE OF THE DAYANANDI DEFINITION.**

Here I can fairly pull up, to put the question, 'Has not now the title to this paper been fully justified?'

**A FARCE, –**

**A RELIGION, PROFESSEDLY BASED ON A BOOK, WHICH AS TRANSLATED FOR THAT RELIGION, HAS NO EXISTENCE.**

On page 7 it was proposed to consider the testimony not only of a single verse, but also that of a 'few epithets' of the 'Idol' Fire. That verse (Rgveda 2. 1. 1.) has been considered. The 'epithets' shall now be taken.

It has been said that out of the 10.177 verses of which the Rgveda consists, 1,962 are occupied with the worship of the Idol, Fire. With whose worship are the remaining 8,215 occupied? The answer is. – Not with any one but with many gods, among whom however the worship of Indra occupies by far the largest share. he being, as I have shown, actually addressed as 'O Indra,' (Thunder god) some 1110 times. (page 6) Now, we have a right to expect that **IF FIRE BE A VEDIC IDOL, THERE MUST BE CERTAIN WORDS USED OF IT AS PROPER TO IT ITSELF AS FIRE, AND DIFFERENTIATING IT FROM THE OTHER GODS.** We find this to be the case.

I. In any account of Fire, there is no word one would expect more largely to hear than the word **KINDLED**. Do we hear this? Yes. The word **समिधान** (being kindled) occurs 29 times, and the word **समिद्ध** (having been kindled) occurs 30 times. These words are met with only in the 1962 verses belonging to our Idol Fire. They never occur in reference to any other god. Why? Because this god of ours is simply **FIRE**. But it is equally clear that this cannot be the god of the Dayanandi definition (p. 2.) Is it not then a 'farce' to say that that is the god of the Veda.?!?



II. Again one naturally expects of Fire that it should **SHINE**. Do we find it so of our Idol Fire? Yes, for 18 times it is addressed thus, "Shine thou" (दीदिति) It is our Idol only that is thus called upon. This of course is what is to be expected. This is clearly a **VISIBLE** god – not that of the Dayanandi definition !!

III. But even more naturally does one expect of Fire that it **BURN**. "Burn thou" (दह) occurs 14 times altogether in the Rgveda. Of these all but once, our Idol Fire is called upon. This is as one might expect. The exception is when Apva (= "deified colic or dysentery" 10. 105. 12. Griffith) is called upon !! Evidently this is not the god of the Dayanandi definition!

IV. But not only by its being 'kindled,' 'shining' and 'burning' does our Idol show itself to be really fire, but also by its 'FOOD.' In 2. 7. 6. our Idol is called dru – anna (द्रवन्न) (in which the word 'dru' is our very word 'tree') which means, "that whose food is wood." Again, in 2. 3. 11; 7. 3. 1.; 5. 8. 6; ghee is expressly said to be its food. When this food – ghee – is given to our Idol sacrificially, it is called havis (हविस) Under this name our Idol's food is mentioned 112 times. This Idol of ours – this Fire, – must have its food to live, – without it, it dies !! Need I say this cannot be the god of the Dayanandi definition !! And yet this is the god of 1962 verses – i. e. one fifth, – of the Rgveda !! Is not the Dayanandi position rightly called "A Farce." !!

V. Again our Idol being Fire, one might expect to find something said as to its **APPEARANCE**. Accordingly

(a) in 5 places it is said to be स्वनीक i. e. 'of beautiful lustre.' The word only occurs these 5 times in the whole of the Rgveda. Of fire only, therefore, is it used. This, of course is what one would expect.

(b) In 2. 8. 2. our Idol is said to be चारुप्रतीक i. e. 'of lovely appearance.' This occurs but once. It is said of our Idol only.

(c) In 2. 1. 9. it is said to be तनूरुच i. e. 'of bright body.' This is a very appropriate description of our Idol. But what becomes of the Dayanandi definition? It repudiates



the idea that its god has a body at all!!

(d) In 2. 9. 1. our Idol is called शुचिजिह्व i. e. 'pure tongued' in reference to the purity of its flame. This occurs but once, - i. e. is said only of our Idol, as might be expected.

Taking these four epithets together we have our Idol's **APPEARANCE** pretty definitely portrayed. **IT HAD A BODY WE ARE TOLD OF BRIGHT, PURE, AND BEAUTIFUL FLAME.** If this be so, then who but an idiot would cavil at the assertion that '**THERE IS IDOLATRY IN THE VEDAS**'! Whatever therefore the Dayanandi Shastra be, it certainly cannot be the Veda.

VI. But if we have an Idol, then that Idol should have a **TEMPLE.** Our Idol has its temple. That was ordinarily the worshipper's own **HOME.** The word for home in this connection is usually दम which is exactly the Latin 'domus.' This word occurs uncompounded 49 times in the Rgveda, once in the Accusative and all the rest in the Vocative. Out of these 49 times, in all but 6 instances, the reference is to our Idol. This fact should be emphasized. **THE FIRE-WORSHIPPER'S OWN HOME CONTAINED HIS IDOL.** It is for this reason that our Idol is called गृहपति i. e. 'house-lord.' Out of the 18 times that the word is used in the Rgveda, in all but once, it is used only of our Idol. We have now come certainly to pretty close quarters with our Idol and with the Dayanandis. As to the former we have **HOUSED** it, and as to the latter we have **UNHOUSED** them, for it ought to be by this time sufficiently clear, that they, in reference to the Veda, are aliens.

VII. It was indeed in the worship of the Altar-fire, whether domestic or public, the imagination of the worshipper gave itself greatest license.

(a) The bright, active, devouring flames of our Idol, suggested that it was its own **PRIEST.** In 2. 1. 2. the work of six different kinds of priests is said to be done by our Idol itself. But amongst these different kinds of priestly work that of the हवितृ (director) is mostly assigned to our fire-god. Were our Idol not Fire, no such concept could possibly have been formed.



(b) Sometimes indeed our Idol, on account of its flame, is called upon to perform **THE WHOLE FUNCTION** of the Sacrifice. The Vedic imperative य॒ज्ञि (‘worship thou’) is used 31 times in the Rgveda. Of these, in all but once, it is our Idol that is called upon, ‘O Fire, worship thou the gods (दे॒वान्)’. Were our Idol not fire, it could scarcely be thus addressed. But still less could it be addressed as the god of the Dayanandi definition. To that the Dayanandis could not consistently say, ‘O god, worship thou the gods.’!! Nevertheless our Idol. – fire – is, I say, thus addressed in the Veda some 30 times, – ‘O fire, worship thou the gods.’

(c) But not only does our Idol do the priest’s work, **IT ALSO DOES THE GODS’ WORK**. That work is devouring the offered oblations. It is our Idol, Fire, that does this for the gods. It is said expressly in 2. 1. 13. that the gods (Adityas) made Fire their **MOUTH** and their **TONGUE**. In the same verse 2. 1. 13. and also in 1. 94. 3. the gods are said to eat the oblation (दे॒विस्र) in our Idol, Fire. Still more definitely it is said in 2. 1. 14. that the ‘immortal gods’ eat the oblation (दे॒विस्र) that had been offered in our Idol, by our Idol’s – the Fire’s – **MOUTH**. The other gods, who-soever they be and how many soever they be, are invisible. Not so our Idol. Its bright, devouring flames, are unmistakably visible and arrest the earnest gaze of its worshippers. Enough. It has been fully demonstrated that. –

#### **THERE IS THEN IDOLATRY IN THE VEDAS.**

This is my fourth pamphlet aiming at bringing home to the Dayanandis the charge of deliberately falsifying the Veda. The three already published, have never been really answered. This charge of course applies not to the rank and file of the party, but to its leaders, and not to all of these, but only to the few who knowing something of Sanskrit make use of that little knowledge to hoodwink their fellow countrymen. Still the rank and file are guilty of a most grave offence in allowing themselves to be so easily deceived. If they do not know Sanskrit, still it is to be presumed that they are not void of common sense, and sheer common sense, if nothing else ought to prevent a man from believing for a moment that, for the thousands of years that have



elapsed since the Vedas were composed, up to the present time, no Hindoo ever really could, or did, interpret those Vedas rightly; and that the first to do so, is Dayanand Saraswati who died ten years ago!!! I say it is inconceivable that any man with common sense could believe this!! The following sentence, taken from the Pioneer of the 21st of April last, shows that there are however men lacking this common sense.

"He (Dayanand Saraswati) rejects Sayanacharya, Mahidhar, and European Sanskrit scholars. translation"!! This is a statement of one calling himself Bhidai Pandit, and hailing from Rae Bareilly. The uninitiated may not know that by saying Dayanand rejected Sayanacharya and Mahidhar, the statement is virtually made that he rejected all the interpretations made by any one soever that ever lived, so far as it militated against his own, - and there is reason to think that there is no one whose interpretation does not militate against Dayanand's.

One naturally asks. "What was Dayananda's motive in making this wholesale perversion of the Vedas?" **NO ONE WHO SEES HOW DELIBERATELY DAYANAND AND HIS FOLLOWERS DO DO THIS CAN BELIEVE FOR ONE MOMENT THAT IT IS RELIGION QUA RELIGION THAT IS THE MOTIVE!** The first requisite in a Religious Reformer is sincerity. Such a man must deal reverently and honestly with the Shashtra he puts forth as authoritative. With the Veda, Dayanand dealt neither reverently nor honestly. Religion therefore was not the motive.

The real motive is suggested in the following extract taken from the Arya Pattrika of April 20. ult.

"This political teaching may prove of great use in deluding the ignorant people of Marwar that should they eat goat's flesh, thus proved from the Vedas, they would conquer irreligious men's countries. We hope that our readers will easily perceive the hidden desire of the publishers of the book, the flesh party, between the above Hindi lines. How they spoil the Holy Vedas to justify their dark designs!" The proverb, 'Put a thief to catch a thief,' is here well exemplified. In this passage the Non-flesh-eating party of the Arya Samaj accuses the Flesh-eating one,



(— This schism has lately split up the Arya Samaj, dividing it into two pretty equal parties —) of doing what they have done, from **POLITICAL** motives. But in point of fact **POLITICAL MOTIVES** are at the bottom of the whole Arya Samaj movement, whether the members be flesh-eaters or non-flesh-eaters. A religious character was given to it by Dayanand simply as a means to this end. Political motives are really those that have attracted even the rank and file. The members of the Arya Samaj are not one whit more religious — rather less so in my opinion, — than their confreres of the old system. The reply usually given by the Aryas as to why they follow Dayananda is that he sought देशकी उन्नति i. e. **THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE COUNTRY**,

(— mark, not - धर्मकी उन्नति **THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE RELIGION** —!) It is, I repeat, a political movement, and Dayananda sought to bind all his countrymen into one compact whole, by giving them **ONE** Shashtra and **ONE** religion, even though he had for this purpose to forge them both.

Of a piece with this impudence and unscrupulousness of the Dayanandis in endeavouring to foist a false interpretation of the Vedas upon their countrymen, is the imposture which is now being practised in the United States by Jinda Ram (Arya Pattrika for March 23rd.), by Baboo Narendra Nath Dutta, alias Swami Vivekananda (Pioneer. Mar. 8th. and Indian Evangelical Review for April) and Virchand A. Gandhe (Times of India April 23). A study of the Puranas shows this to be a thoroughly Brahmanic procedure, carried on in India successfully for ages. It is not very much to the credit of the keen witted Americans that they should in any degree, have allowed themselves to have been so deluded, for they already had before them literature on the subject in abundance. But any one with a knowledge of Sanskrit and Sanskrit Literature, and that not necessarily profound, is able to at once detect the imposture.

May 3. '94

T. Williams.







